

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 13 2006

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed March 13, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks are submitted in response thereto. Claims 1-16 are pending in the application.

The rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cruickshank in view of Simonoff is respectfully traversed.

The present invention provides improved sharing of computer resources between users of two computers connected by an internetwork. Representative claim 1 recites a method wherein served resources residing in a first computer are shared between the first computer and a second computer. Call clients are run in each of the first and second computers for establishing a data call in response to a database of IP addresses. A request for sharing said served resources is generated within the first or second computer. A server application is run in the first computer for hosting the served resources. Client applications are run in the first and second computers for retrieving the served resources from the server application simultaneously.

The server application and the client application running in the second computer exchange network packets in response to the IP addresses used by the call clients. Thus, one important aspect of the claimed invention is that the resources to be shared include a server application, and these resources are accessed using a client application regardless of whether the served resources are being accessed by the user of the first computer or the second computer. In other words, the server running on the first computer could be streaming video data to client applications (e.g., media players) on both the first and second computers simultaneously, resulting in simplified and shared control of the shared resource between the two computer users.

In Cruickshank, the "resident collaboration applications in personal computers 112 and 122 may be any compatible collaboration applications, although for optimum performance they should be identical applications." Thus, the claimed arrangement of a

-2-

(Serial No. 10/058,549)

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 13 2006

server application for hosting served resources on the first computer and separate client applications on the first and second computers for retrieving the served resources is not taught by Cruickshank.

The rejection relies on Simonoff to allegedly disclose "running a server application in the computer for hosting the served resources, and retrieving the server resources from the server applications simultaneously." However, in Simonoff each client computer is separate from the server computer and the server application is exclusively operated on the centralized server computer (col. 6, line 39 to col. 7, line 6; and Figure 3). Thus, Simonoff teaches away from the claimed elements of claims 1-16 wherein both a server application and a client application are run on the first computer. Normally, one skilled in the art would not expect to operate both a server and client application on the same computer because since the resource resides on the computer it can be accessed directly by the user of the computer without the need for a client and server. The server application of Simonoff which is remote from each of the clients fails to either teach or suggest the arrangement in claims 1-16 which achieves improvements in the interaction of both users participating in a data call. By providing identical interfaces between each participant in the data call with the resource being shared (i.e., by means of each of them accessing the served resource with their own client application), an identical user experience is given to both users even though the resource being shared is local to one of the users.

Claim 2 recites that the IP address used in the call client of the first computer is reported to the server application and that the server application sends a session initiation message to the client application running on the second computer. Claim 3 recites an alternative embodiment wherein the IP address used in the call client of the second computer is reported to the client application running in the second computer and wherein the client application running in the second computer sends a session initiation message to the server application. These claims each result in two separate data sessions between the computers, one for the data call and one for sharing the server resources. The use of these

-3-

(Serial No. 10/058,549)

multiple sessions is lacking from Cruickshank and Simonoff, individually or in combination. Claims 12 and 13 recite the same limitations. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 12, and 13 are separately patentable.

Claims 4-6, 9, 10, and 14-16 recite other aspects of the operation of the server application and are therefore separately patentable.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, claims 1-16 are now in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Mollon
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,123

Dated: June 13, 2006
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(734) 542-0900
(734) 542-9569 (fax)